



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/596,195	06/17/2000	JASON R. WILCOX	1018.084US1	1771

27792 7590 01/31/2003

MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON  
600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507  
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

EXAMINER

DURAN, ARTHUR D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/596,195

Applicant(s)  
Wilcox et al

Examiner  
Arthur Duran

Art Unit  
3622



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W. Myhre

(3) Michael King

(2) Arthur Duran

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 30, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 8 and 13

Identification of prior art discussed:  
Brown et al (6,026,368)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Applicant Representative discussed the features of claims 8 and 13 and related them to the disclosure of Brown. After further discussion, it was determined that the Examiner was equating Brown's priority queues and advertisements therein with the Applicant's item slot groups and item slots, respectively. The Applicant Representative stated that he will further review the reference in view of this relationship and determine whether to further amend the claims or present arguments in response to the final rejection issued on January 3, 2002.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

ARTHUR DURAN  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3622

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required